

Date: Tue, 9 Aug 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #361
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 9 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 361

Today's Topics:

 CW ...IS history!
 CW Testing
 Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?
 ITU Treaty

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 8 Aug 1994 16:28:28 GMT
From: galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS history!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <H\$aHkiubGMSJ066yn@access.digex.net>, domonkos@access.digex.net (Andy Domonkos) writes:

>Are your friends in communications, intelligence, or INFOSEC? If it's the
>latter of the two I'd doubt they'd tell you, lest they were bullshitters.

They are in communications. That's it. Jobs range from running all
communications for an entire Air Force Base to running around with
the grunts to supply communications with the Air Force.

Date: Sat, 06 Aug 1994 16:03:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW Testing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Neil D. Friedman <ndfriedman@delphi.com> writes:

>Mack Ray <mack@mails.imed.COM> writes:

>
>> My biggest complaint with the last code test I took (passed
>> Advanced written in my sleep, failed the code again) was that the room
>> was very noisy (much like 80m novice CW on a midwest summer evening)
>
>I absolutely agree and have been campaigning against this in local VE tests.
>Virtually all CQ ops wear phones and for good reason. To test license
>applicants with a tinny recorder on the other side of a room is ridiculous.

I too have complained about this. I have even offered to help build a
splitter box w/speaker for head phones and a speaker.

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Sat, 06 Aug 1994 16:09:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:

>In article <1994Aug4.135127.11618@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:
>
>
>>I disagree. Manual Morse encoding of alphabet is a conditioned response
>>very much different from general visual or aural interpretation. Those
>>latter are wired in from birth in most humans. A baby with no formal
>>training at all learns to recognize faces and recognize speech as early
>>as 3 months old. Not so for manual Morse encoding of alphabet. It's a
>>trick, like that of a lightning calculator, that only very rare individuals
>>possess to a high degree, even after months or years of rigorous conditioning.
>
>I disagree. The jumble of curved and straight line segments you are looking at

>on the face of the CRT took you several years of schooling and/or parental
>guidance to be able to decode into thoughts. You were not born with it. It
>is just another facet of your "wetware modem(s)". Just another sensory port.
>Yes, even you have one! Can everyone do it? - not necessarily and certainly
>not all to the same degree. Well golly gee, maybe we should eliminate all
>literacy tests and requirements then.

No one is suggesting anything of the sort and you know it. You can't
win the argument on merit and so resort to name calling.

Besides, we have already 'conditioned' to decode English in this form as
it is NECESSARY to written communications used world wide even outside
of amateur radio and in all aspects of life. Wetware decoding of manual
morse is not necessary to non ham communications. In fact wetware
decoding slows the process down. If it did not, commercial interests
would not have abandoned it as to slow and expensive (read useless).

>>>All of this is good, and tends to equip the candidate with sufficient
>>>skills except one. You have miserably failed to equip the candidate with
>>>the means to interpret over half of what he hears and may need to respond
>>>to on HF which is CW QSO's!

>

>

>> All the government should do is make sure the applicant can operate
>>safely and not deliberately interfere with others. No one has to know Morse
>>at a specific speed to recognize whether there is a signal present or not.
>>The choice of mode should be his alone. If he wants to do manual Morse,
>>he'll do the conditioning, if not, he won't. It's self-enforcing, no test

>

^^^^^^

>>necessary.

>^^^^^^^^^^

>

>>Gary

>

>This attitude leads to the conclusion that no test is required. Just some
>kind of registration and convincing someone that you do not intend mayhem,
>ineptitude withstanding of course. Sound familiar?

Again, not what was said. Try learning to read (your wetware decoding of
written English is in need of work. (That word again) Instead of
beeping, why not try reading now and then. Or run the text thru your
computer to make it beep at you as comprehension of written word seems
beyond you wetware modems programming and capability.

>73,

>C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX

>wyn@ornl.gov

^^^ This could explain a lot...

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Tue, 9 Aug 94 00:46:00 -0400

From: news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@uunet.uu.net

Subject: ITU Treaty

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kj>.2517@mixcom.mixcom.com>

kj>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy

kj>Organization: Milwaukee Internet Xchange BBS, Milw, WI (414) 241-5469

kj>Regarding the ITU, do they actually specify a "word per minute"

kj>Morse proficiency? What exactly IS "knowledge of Morse code"?

kj>If "knowlegde of Morse" is so important for HF access, why is there

kj>NOT periodic retesting to guarantee proficiency at a given WPM rate?

Hmmmmmmmmmm.....Hmmmmmmmmmm.....natch satch!

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0

abm@world.std.com

. CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Sat, 06 Aug 1994 16:35:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!

amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <31p3e2\$174@chnews.intel.com>, <467@ted.win.net>,

<31ubqr\$euj@chnews.intel.com>

Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

jbromley@scorpion.ch.intel.com (James Bromley~) writes:

>Consequently, I currently favor the complete and total abolition of

>the use of Morse encoding in the amateur radio service with severe

>penalties for all who persist in this anachronistic practice.

>

>That's the way it ought to be!

I begin to agree with you Jim. Despite the fact that I have been open to compromise for a while now. I get tired of the attacks (then I respond in kind). Maybe just eliminate the damn thing and we can forget about perserving the history of radio.

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: 8 Aug 1994 16:13:37 GMT

From: galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.90.2E3FB896@ornl.gov>, <1994Aug4.135127.11618@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <wyn.96.2E422994@ornl.gov>, <wyn.106.2E46239C@ornl.gov>

Reply-To : twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu

Subject : Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

In article <wyn.106.2E46239C@ornl.gov>, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:
>I think the point has been made several times here that there is nothing
>arbitrary about the CW test requirements

And many others think this point has *not* been made. Hence, the disagreement.

Date: 7 Aug 1994 11:58:14 -0700

From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CtyxLJ.FKn@cadre.com>, <31ok3k\$4ks@Tut.MsState.Edu>,

<CtzMHY.LLx@world.std.com>app

Subject : Re: CW ...IS history!

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>Michael C Fortner (mcf2@Isis.MsState.Edu) wrote:

>: *Typical HF conversation*

>: Ham 1: CQ, CQ, CQ this is W40M calling CQ.
 >: Ham 2: W40M, W40M, W40M this is N0ZHY, N0ZHY, N0ZHY, over.
 >: Ham 1: (Ignoring obvious No-Code upgrade) CQ, CQ, CQ from W40M.
 >: Ham 2: W40M, W40M, W40M, this is N0ZHY, N0!#\$%&^.... (walked over by
 >: Ham 3's 1.5 kW station since N0ZHY is obviously a no-code upgrade)
 >: Ham 3: W40M this is K20F.
 >: W40M: K20F, this is W40M. You're 5-9, rig here is a TS50S. Weather here is
 >: raining/snowing/hot/cold. Over.
 >: K20F: QSL. You're 5-9, rig here is a TS50S into a 3 element beam.
 >: Weather here is hot/cold/rain/snow/sun/clouds. Over.
 >: W40M: QSL. Talk to you later. 73, over.
 >: K20F: QSL. 73 and nice talking to you. Out.

>: Sound familiar?

>Uh, no.

Yep. I too don't think that sounds familiar, either. I have to yet hear a single TS-50. People run 950s or 965s and 1000s on HF :-). Plus an Alpha :-).

And, here are HF phone "QSOs" which you are more likely to stumble on:

- 1) %^\$&*& 6MF %\$%#&#&
 6MF 59
 Kilo-Zulu-6-Mike-Fox 59
 QSL KZ6MF QRZ T31BB
 ^%\$%#&\$@ #^%@#%#&@&&
- 2) "Gentlemen, your last two"
 ^%#&@^#&@& Foxtrot-Uniform ^%#&@%#&@&
 later ...
 VR6DB you are 2 by 2, one-two by one-two, KY2FU. QSL?
 <dead silence from VR6DB>
- 3) ... my hemorrhoids are flaring up again...

<grin>

73

Kok Chen, AA6TY
 Apple Computer, Inc.

kchen@apple.com

Date: Sat, 06 Aug 1994 16:17:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.90.2E3FB896@ornl.gov>, <080594004026Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<wyn.98.2E422D5D@ornl.gov>rg
Subject : Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:

>In article <080594004026Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>

>>>

>>>All of this is good, and tends to equip the candidate with sufficient
>>>skills except one. You have miserably failed to equip the candidate with
>>>the means to interpret over half of what he hears and may need to respond
>>>to on HF which is CW QSO's!

>

>>Please quote where you got the proof that half the QSO's are CW (I assume
>>you mean manual morse not CW as MANY other modes use CW). If you mean the
>>Jeff Herman INFORMAL survey, please document the survey and describe how
>>scientific it was and what was the degree of accuracy involved.

>>

>>Dan N8PKV

>

>If you really need proof, just run your own survey. You might observe some
>other interesting facets while you are at it.

I did, on field day on 20 meters. My results were more like 30/70. This
was NOT an attempt to DO a survey, I was curious and a few times just ran
from one end of the band to another. I did not count nor did I write
anything down. I was considering suggesting we move the station from ssb
to CW, since there were more SSB calls heard I didn't even mention it to
anyone.

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Sat, 06 Aug 1994 16:25:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <31rr8l\$jh9@agate.berkeley.edu>, <wyn.104.2E4259B4@ornl.gov>,
<31tnej\$j22@news.iastate.edu>, <bmicale.197.2E42F88B@facstaff.wisc.edu>
Subject : Re: New Idea

bmicale@facstaff.wisc.edu (Bruce Micales) writes:

>In article <31tnej\$j22@news.iastate.edu> twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu writes:
>>Path: news.doit.wisc.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!
news.iastate.edu!isuvax.iastate.edu!TWP77
>
>>In article <wyn.104.2E4259B4@ornl.gov>, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:
>>>First, I think there is provisions now for no-coders to do DWB (Data Wide Band)
>>>on HF.
>
>>Where are these provisions? Technicians can only operate on 6 meters and up.
>
>You mean no-code Technicians. Technicians PLUS can operate on novice HF.

There is no such thing as a 'no-code Technician'. There are Technicians and
Technicians Plus (Novice HF). His statement was totally correct, yours the
first sentence is not defined in Part 97. Your second sentence defines
Technician Plus, but has nothing to do with what you quoted.

Just an attempt to name call and divide the Amateur community, huh?

>
>Bruce Micales (TECH PLUS)
>WA2DEU
^^^^^^ Are we supposed to be impressed (CAPS AND ALL)?

Dan N8PKV

--
"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Sat, 06 Aug 1994 15:49:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.775860277@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,
<080494231648Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <paulf.776111847@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: CW ...IS history!

paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>

>>The Coast Guard is NOT part of the military and does not fall under the
>>DOD, but you knew that didn't ya?.....

>

>Nice try, pal. USCG can fall under either DOC or DOD, or both, by Presidential
>directive. The transfer is done austensibly in time of war, but was done,
>for example, during Vietnam.

Gee, bet the guys who fought in 'nam thought it sure looked and quacked
like a war (see below).

> That's how all of the Coasties wound up driving
>landing craft (where better to get people with small boat shallow water ops?).
>USCG and USN also share a number of COMMSTA facilities.

And the DOD and NOAA (NWS) share a radar system (Doppler). The NASA and
DOD share the shuttle (or did). So? Consolidation of resources is a way to
save money, not proof that the Coast Guard is military. The military is
PROHIBITED from enforcing civilian law (except now for drugs, more to
come) but the Coast Guard is not.

>If the Coast Guard isn't military, it sure quacks like the duck.

It is not, plain and simple. It can be used in time of war as such.
However it is not part of the DOD. The old War Department could use
anything in the nation in time of war, if needed. Does that make civilian
airliners part of the military because they 'quacked like a duck' in the
past? No, it does not.

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Mon, 8 Aug 1994 14:02:25 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!

howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!cs.utk.edu!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!

wyn@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <31p3e2\$174@chnews.intel.com>, <467@ted.win.net>,
<1994Aug7.165728.29997@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>i

```
>> The disturbing fact is that
>>the majority of no-code techs are not becoming league members. These
>>folks are entering the amateur fraternity in non-traditional ways now, i.e.
>>lots of self-study instead of thru a club-sponsored classes, and such.
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
```

>>Many are flying solo, they aren't becoming members of either the league
>>or established amateur clubs.

>

>From what I read on here the present day tests don't require much self-
>study.

Maybe you should take time. I did it all with self study, except for half
a Novice class that I took about 8 or more years ago (Passed the 5 WPM
code on straight copy, never took the written). Maybe we ALL should take a
look at the question pools and help improve them. (Maybe some here should
read the question on what is NOT a purpose of the ARS. Hint: The correct
answere is Preserve the history of the radio art.)

Dan

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

Date: Sat, 6 Aug 1994 16:28:37 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!
gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Ctvt69.D3K@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <RFM.94Aug2091338@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<CtxIr1.8q5@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <CtxIr1.8q5@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

>In article <RFM.94Aug2091338@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard
McAllister) writes:

>>The Big Kahuna said:

>>>2. It makes sense to require a skill test for the most popular modes

>>>on HF (there is already a code-free license for access to V/UHF).

>>>Currently CW and SSB are the two most popular modes on HF; it's not

>>>my fault there is no skill test for SSB.

>>

>>By this argument we also ought to test for international postal

>>regulations (for sending QSL cards) and medical terminology (so

>>the majority of phone QSOs will be understandable.)

>

>These are not widely used modes of communication on HF, Rich.

Of course they are Jeff. Postal card collecting seems to dominate
HF operation. It's rarely seen on the VHF+ bands. And talking about

their medical problems and operations seems the favorite passtime of most of the geriatric set that dominate 75 meters and parts of 40 and 20 meters. A HF operator won't be able to successfully communicate with these HF operators if he doesn't understand what they talk about, not that they'll talk to anyone with other than a W#XX call anyway.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #361
